

EXHIBIT 8

The Job-Relatedness of the Selection Procedures at Issue in *Brown, et al. v.*

Nucor Corporation and Nucor Steel-Berkeley

Preliminary Expert Report of Michael R. Buckley

September 8, 2006

Introduction and Purpose

The author of this report is Michael R. Buckley of Norman, Oklahoma. I am currently employed as the JC Penney Company Business Leadership Chair, a Professor of Management and a Professor of Psychology in the Michael F. Price College of Business at the University of Oklahoma. I hold a Ph.D. in Industrial and Organizational Psychology, conferred by Auburn University in 1985. My primary roles are as a Professor and researcher in human resources management issues, a human resources management consultant, and a University of Oklahoma Departmental Chair. I have consulted in a number of employment-related court actions concerning an evaluation of the quality of human resources practices. I am being compensated for preparing this report at the rate of \$450.00 per hour. Additional information concerning my background appears in my resume (copy attached).

I have been asked by counsel for the plaintiffs to review materials documenting the selection procedures used to hire and promote employees at Nucor-Berkeley's (hereafter Nucor) Huger, South Carolina plants to assess whether those procedures meet the requirements embodied in professional standards and the *Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures* (29CFR1607), and to offer opinions regarding whether the selection processes used by Nucor are demonstrably job-related and competently conducted.

Summary Opinion

The selection procedures used by Nucor to make hiring and promotion decisions fail, in my studied opinion, to meet applicable professional or regulatory standards for establishing the job-relatedness or validity of employee selection procedures. Nucor procedures can be characterized by the subjective combination of factors that are themselves often subjective in nature. In cases when some more objective procedures were utilized (e.g., the written hiring test or evaluation, the skills and technical test for some positions), the data arising from those procedures were combined with other information in undocumented processes whose chief component was the subjective combination/weighting of factors together to arrive at a judgment regarding which candidate was "best qualified." From a human resources perspective, this is not a competent selection system.

Nucor would be hard pressed to demonstrate the validity of any of its selection procedures. There exists scant documentation of the selection/promotion decisions that have been made. Furthermore, individual selection officials may have used idiosyncratic selection criteria. Thus, conducting a validation study would be difficult at best. Due to the subjectivity and measurement error existing in this process, any predictor-criterion relationships would be spurious. There are numerous other measurement issues precluding a competent validity study.

From my reading of the information I have been provided, it appears to me as though Nucor does not possess the information that might be used to illustrate the job-relatedness of their process. This job-relatedness is required by the *Uniform Guidelines* and acceptable professional standards. Nucor officials did not report any systematic job analyses, a requirement of both professional standards and the *Uniform Guidelines*. In the absence of a competently conducted job analysis, Nucor is unable to demonstrate any linkage between its selection procedures and the content of jobs at Nucor's Huger, South Carolina plant. Importantly, Nucor selection procedures do not meet the validity requirements embodied in professional standards and the *Uniform Guideline*. They would be well advised to replace

the procedures they have utilized with a professionally developed, valid, and job-related set of procedures.

I have detected no systematic process for ensuring validity in the selection procedures utilized by Nucor managers and supervisors. From the depositions I have read I have concluded that managers were unable to provide detailed descriptions of the both procedures they used and the procedures used by their subordinate managers. Further, they were unfamiliar with the procedures used in other departments at Nucor. A number of the deposed individuals appeared to be aware of the Nucor written policy on hiring, promotions, and transfers, and repeatedly indicated that they do not adhere to the written policy. I would suggest that the situation indicated a lack of management controls at many levels which resulted in a drift away from sound human resources management practices.

Source Documents

In conducting my evaluation, I relied primarily upon the following documents:

1. The complaint filed on behalf of the plaintiffs in the United States District Court (Case No. 2:04-22005-12BG Class Action)
2. Nucor Steel Berkeley Employee's Handbook.
3. The deposition transcript of Ladd Hall;
4. The deposition transcript of Paul Ferguson;
5. The deposition transcript of Al Smith;
6. The deposition transcript of John Bell;
7. The deposition transcript of William Roberson;
8. The deposition transcript of Meleah Barnhill;
9. The deposition transcript of David Sumoski.

The Selection Procedures Utilized by Nucor

The Nucor Steel Berkeley Employee's Handbook outlines the procedure for hiring, promotions, and transfers (B-13):

1. It is company policy to promote from within the corporate organization rather than fill job or position opening from the outside.
2. Management shall attach considerable weight to the opinions and recommendations of the supervisor to whom the employee will report. Each employee will have the opportunity to participate in a written 6-month evaluation with their supervisors.
3. Management will select the most qualified individuals for the position based on, but not limited to, the following qualifications:
 - Skills possessed for the job or opening, education, experience, attitude, dependability, growth potential, judgement, relations with others, ability to direct others, Stability, Length of service.

Other than what is in the Handbook, The Personnel Supervisor (Meleah Barnhill) was unaware of any policies or procedures regarding hirings, promotions, and transfers (Barnhill deposition, p. 84). Others expressed that they were not aware of this written policy on the hiring process (Roberson deposition, p. 90).

The hiring criteria that are expressed in the Handbook appear to be well thought out. When I see a statement like that above regarding selection criteria, I would assume that there exists a series of job analyses that could be used to adjust the selection criteria for each job. A competently done job analysis contains two parts—a job description (an outline of the duties and task required for successful completion of the position) and a job specification (the Knowledges, Skills, and Abilities required to successful completion of the position). The Personnel Supervisor was not aware whether there were job descriptions for all positions (Barnhill deposition, p. 11). Any selection program should be based on the job analysis that exists for the focal position.

It is quite difficult for me to get a good handle on the selection process used by Nucor officials. Many managers and supervisors considered a different subset of criteria from among: 1) scores (the number of items missed) on a written hiring evaluation; 2)

work history/job experience; 3) technical skills; 4) attendance, safety records, disciplinary records; 5) job performance; 6) cross-training and/or other job experiences; 7) job skills listed on the job posting; 8) interview results; and 9) numerous other idiosyncratic factors (including "gut feeling"—Ferguson deposition, p. 275).

The most common employment practices I noticed in my consideration was the subjective combination of the above listed factors, with individually determined weights, yielding a score which indicated to the selection official the person who was "most qualified" for the focal position. I read of no attempts to insure that the same set of criteria was being applied to each applicant (see, for example, Smith deposition, p. 299). This is not, in my opinion, an effective human resources practice. The best sentiment I can muster in favor of the aforementioned selection procedure is that it is consistent in its inconsistency.

Related Human Resources Concerns

It was quite difficult, as mentioned to get a handle on the weighting used by different individuals. They were all over the range of potential weightings. One individual (Bell deposition, pg. 29-33) reported that he added up the points and always picked the person who had the highest score—even if the top scorer was one point higher than the next candidate. From a measurement perspective, I know something important—with all measurement there is a standard error of measurement—some things, especially subjective issues are measured with some degree of imprecision. Each observed score has two components associated with it—one is the true score (i.e., the "eye of God reality") and the other component is error of measurement which could range from inability to observe to poor measurement instrument to a poor observer of the issue in question. Picking the person who scores the most points makes the faulty assumption that measurement is precise when, in fact, it is not. The difference between one who scores 7/10 and another who scores 7.1/10 may fall well within the standard error of measurement. Frankly, the aforementioned candidates may be quite similar, only differentiated by measurement error.

One selection factor used by one of the managers was a locally developed test (Bell deposition, pg. 18-23). It was developed by "the technical person in the area, myself, and the lead supervisor." It was his contention that the test was "a hundred percent job

specific." This test should have been evaluated by a professional test developer. It is important that if tests are to be used for selection process that they possess both reliability (consistency of measurement) and validity (related to some important job-related criterion). This may well have been an effective test. We will not know, unless some documentation is presented, of the effectiveness of this test is presented. In the absence of reliability and validity data, one cannot come to a conclusion pertaining to the psychometric soundness of the test. Validity studies of selection components have not been conducted (Barnhill deposition, p. 68)

There is a consistent lack of record keeping throughout the depositions. When asked to produce records of decisions, a most common response was that there were few available. Surprisingly, even when records were created, they were oftentimes not kept. This was especially true with regard to interview criteria and interview decisions. In the absence of accurate record keeping it is quite difficult to demonstrate the effectiveness of human resources decisions. It is difficult to analyze predictor/criterion relationships without the information concerning human resources decisions and how they relate to subsequent job related outcomes. For example, do those who do better on a test measuring ability X perform better than those who do not score as well on ability X. I find the lack of competent record keeping by Nucor to be quite alarming in this case.

Lastly, I am concerned that "gut feelings" (e.g., Ferguson deposition, p. 275) are mentioned in a number of different selection contexts. There is no place in a selection system for "gut feelings." Gut feelings are typically visceral reactions to someone and are oftentimes countered by subsequent experience with the individual in question. Reasoned decisions, based on job related criteria, should replace "gut feelings."

Data Necessary for Nucor to Collect

In *Watson v. Fort Worth Bank and Trust*, 487 US 977 (1988), the Supreme Court reasoned that promotion policies that include subjective components, like those utilized by Nucor, are subject to disparate impact analysis. Consequently, adverse impact analysis of

selection processes, regardless of whether they involve subjective decision-making or objective measures, have become the standard operating procedure in many organizations. Apparently, Nucor has not collected any data pertaining to this issue (Hall deposition, p. 90-91). There is a need to determine whether any of the selection procedures utilized by Nucor result in differential impact (procedures that on the surface seem neutral but result in differential selection ratios).

Job Relatedness Must be Demonstrated

The acceptable technical standards for determining the validity, or job relatedness, of selection procedures are available in the Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures (29 CFR, 1607 et seq.). The Personnel Supervisor expressed no knowledge of validation processes nor of the Uniform Guidelines (Barnhill deposition, p. 68). The Guidelines state as an example:

Users choosing to validate a selection procedure by a content validity strategy should determine whether it is appropriate to conduct such a study in the particular employment context. A selection procedure can be supported by a content validity strategy to the extent that it is a representative sample of the content of the job. Selection procedures which purport to measure knowledges, skills, or abilities may in certain circumstances be justified by content validity, although they may not be representative samples, if the knowledge, skill, or ability measured by the selection procedure can be operationally defined as provided in paragraph 14C(4) of this section, and if that knowledge, skill, or ability is a necessary prerequisite to successful job performance [29CFR14C(1)].

As can be found in any Human Resources management textbook, the most important step in any validation study is the conduct of a competent job analysis. I have not read any information in the material that would indicate to me that this information is available.

Nucor needs to update/develop/ initiate their job analysis portfolio and make it available to selection officials.

The *Uniform Guidelines* have addressed the issues concerning using job analyses in the context of a validation strategy, namely:

There should be a job analysis which includes an analysis of the important work behavior(s) required for successful performance and their relative importance and, if the behavior results in work product(s), an analysis of the work product(s). Any job analysis should focus on the work behavior(s) and the tasks associated with them. If work behavior(s) are not observable, the job analysis should identify and analyze those aspects of the behavior(s) that can be observed and the observed work products. The work behavior(s) selected for measurement should be critical work behavior(s) and/or important work behavior(s) constituting most of the job [29CFR14C(2)].

The *Uniform Guidelines* provide specific instructions on the documentation required for such job analyses at 29CFR1607.15C(3):

A description of the method used to analyze the job should be provided (essential). The work behavior(s), the associated tasks, and, if the behavior results in a work product, the work products should be completely described (essential). Measures of criticality and/or importance of the work behavior(s) and the method of determining these measures should be provided (essential). Where the job analysis also identified the knowledges, skills, and abilities used in work behavior(s), an operational definition for each knowledge in terms of a body of learned information and for each skill and ability in terms of observable behaviors and outcomes, and the relationship between each knowledge, skill, or ability and each work behavior, as well as the method used to determine this relationship, should be provided (essential). The work situation should be described, including the setting in which work behavior(s) are performed, and where appropriate, the manner in which knowledges, skills, or abilities are used, and the complexity and difficulty of the knowledge, skill, or ability as used in the work behavior(s).

It appears to me that Nucor does not have this type of information readily available for selection officials.

All of this information taken together indicate to me that Nucor is apparently unable to satisfy 29CFR1607.15C(5), which states:

The evidence demonstrating that the selection procedure is a representative work sample, a representative sample of the work behavior(s), or a representative sample of a knowledge, skill, or ability as used as a part of a work behavior and necessary for that behavior should be provided (essential). The user should identify the work behavior(s) which each item or part of the selection procedure is intended to sample or measure (essential). Where the selection procedure purports to sample a work behavior or to provide a sample of a work product, a comparison should be provided of the manner, setting, and the level of complexity of the selection procedure with those of the work situation (essential).

I don't mean to be snide but I am unable to determine where a "gut feeling" fits in to this procedure. No data has been forthcoming that would allow the identification of the work behavior(s) which each part of the selection procedure measures. Therefore, I must conclude that Nucor's selection procedures fail to comply with neither accepted professional standards nor the Uniform Guidelines.

Alternatives Nucor may have considered

There are a number of traditional alternatives that could have been considered by Nucor. For example, they could have considered the development of a structured interview--in which all individuals are asked the same set of questions. This ensures more of a uniform, consistent, and fair approach to interviewing and allows the development of a uniform scoring system and moves the interview toward a more objective platform. A procedure in which supervisors asked similar interview questions was alluded to (Bell deposition, 150-152) but, as in many other situations outlined in the material, a uniform scoring method was not discussed. Lack of structure in an interview facilitates injecting individual bias into the process.

Some recent research I have conducted indicates that panel interviews may be a good alternative to the unstructured subjective interviews outlined in this material. Candidates could be interviewed by more than one interviewee. Then the performance of each candidate could be discussed. This is an effective process as we all key in on different segments of performance. It is a much fairer process for candidates. Panels should be racially diverse. This would allow opportunities for member of groups, other than the majority group, to become involved in the selection process. Panels should be given a group of structured interview questions for the candidate to answer, along with a standard scoring guide to evaluate the answers of the candidate. Higher validity coefficients are associated with this type of interviewing. Overall, Nucor needs to more closely monitor the processes utilized by selection officials.

Overall Conclusion

I believe that the procedures used by Nucor to make selection decisions at the Huger, South Carolina plant do not meet applicable professional or regulatory standards for establishing the job-relatedness or validity of the procedures they use in the hiring/ promotion/ transfer process. As I have outlined in this report:

- 1) They use subjective criteria and combine them in a number of unsystematic ways in order to winnow out a decision concerning job suitability;
- 2) They have failed to demonstrate the job-relatedness of the processes they use in the hiring/ promotion/ transfer process;

- 3) Different supervisors utilized different criteria weighting schemes with little consistency among the selection officials and among the different hiring/promotion/ transfer opportunities. "Cut feelings" should not be a factor in the hiring/promotion/ transfer process;
- 4) They have overlooked some elementary measurement issues with respect to selection processes that have rendered a number of their reported selection programs imprecise;
- 5) Record keeping issues need to be addressed. It seems that no one is really sure what records exist and how they may be obtained;
- 6) Nucor needs to be more concerned with demonstrations of the job-relatedness of the hiring/ promotion/ transfer procedures they use. Nucor has apparently made little attempt to ensure the validity of the aforementioned;
- 7) There are a number of alternative procedures that Nucor could consider that might be helpful in moving them in the direction of more effective and efficient hiring/ promotion/ transfer programs; and
- 8) There exist insufficient management controls with respect to the hiring/ promotion/ transfer programs at Nucor.

Certification

I hereby certify that the report appearing above was written by Michael R. Buckley. I certify that I have no interest, present or contemplated, in the above referenced matter, and that the compensation for the effort to produce the report is not contingent upon any

conclusions reached therein. I certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, all statements and information contained in the report are true and correct.

Michael Buckley

PAGE 1

VITA

MICHAEL RONALD BUCKLEY
JC Penney Company Chair of Business Leadership

Professor of Management
Professor of Psychology

Division of Management
College of Business Administration
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma 73019
Ph: (405) 325-5729
Fax: (405) 325-1957
E-mail: mbuckley@ou.edu

Personal Data

Date of Birth: November 3, 1955
Place of Birth: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Home Address: 4517 Beckett Court
Norman, Oklahoma 73072
Home Phone: (405) 364-8413

Education

Ph.D. Psychology, Auburn University, 1985
Major Field: Industrial/Organizational Psychology
Minor Field: Human Resource Management and Organizational Behavior
Major Professor: Achilles A. Armenakis (Department of Management)

M.S. Psychology, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1980
Major Field: Industrial/ Organizational Psychology
Minor Field: Quantitative Methods
Major Professor: H. John Bernardin

B.A. Psychology, LaSalle College, 1977

Employment History

PAGE 2

January, 2004- Present	Appointed to the JC Penney Company Chair of Business Leadership (Permanent Appointment)
July, 2000 - January, 2004	Appointed to the McCasland Foundation Professorship of American Free Enterprise (Permanent appointment)
April, 2000 - 2004	Tom G. Clark Presidential Professor (4 year term appointment)
July, 1998 - present	Director, Division of Management John and Mary Nichols Research Fellow
August, 1997 - August, 1999	Conoco Research Fellow
August, 1996 - present	Professor of Psychology
July, 1995 - present	Professor of Management, Division of Management, University of Oklahoma
July, 1994 - August, 1996	O.L. Ted Taylor Research Fellow, College of Business Administration, University of Oklahoma
August, 1988 - July, 1995	Associate Professor, Division of Management, University of Oklahoma
June, 1987 - August, 1988	Assistant Professor, Division of Management, University of Oklahoma
January, 1985 - June, 1987	Assistant Professor, Department of Management Systems, Washington State University
September, 1981 - December 1984	Graduate Research Assistant, Auburn Technical Assistance Center
September, 1981 - April, 1982	Graduate Teaching Assistant, Department of Management and Psychology, Auburn University
April, 1980 - September, 1981	Personnel Research Psychologist, United States General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

PAGE 3

September, 1978 - April, 1980

Graduate Teaching Assistant, Virginia
Polytechnic Institute and State University

Awards and Honors

Selected as the JC Penney Company Chair of Business Leadership, 2004

Selected as the McCasland Foundation Professor of American Free Enterprise,
2000

Selected as the Tom G. Clark Presidential Professor ("for meeting the highest
standards of excellence in research and teaching") for a four year term, 2000.

Selected as a John and Mary Nichols research Fellow, Michael F. Price College
of Business, 1998

Selected as the Conoco Research Fellow, 1997, Michael F. Price College of
Business, University of Oklahoma.

Repeat Recipient of the Dikeman Award for Article of the Year in the *Oklahoma
Business Bulletin*, 1995, 1997.

Recipient of the Bruce Magoon Master Teacher Award, College of Business
Administration, University of Oklahoma, 1995.

Selected as the O. L. Ted Taylor Research Fellow, College of Business
Administration, University of Oklahoma, 1994.

Recipient of the Coopers and Lybrand Award for Teaching Excellence, College
of Business Administration, University of Oklahoma, 1991.

Recipient of the Shell Award for Teaching Excellence, College of Business and
Economics, Washington State University, 1986.

RESEARCH

A note on the existence and nature of racial bias in supervisory ratings, In Press,
Journal of Applied Psychology.

A Note on the Need for True Scores in Frame-of-Reference (FOR) Training
Research, in Press, *Journal of Managerial Issues*.

Leader political skill and employee reactions, In press, *Leadership Quarterly*.

Burnout and Engagement as Role-Based Organizational Outcomes, In Press, *Journal of Management*.

Managing Agreement in the Contemporary Global Business Environment: Reexamining the Abilene Paradox after Thirty-Years, In Press, *Organizational Dynamics*.

The Role of Pluralistic Ignorance in Perceptions of Unethical Behavior: An Investigation of Attorneys' and Student's Perceptions of Ethical Behavior, In Press, *Ethics and Behavior*.

This is war: How the politically astute achieve crimes of obedience through the use of moral disengagement, In Press, *Leadership Quarterly*.

Awareness of temporal complexity in the leadership of creativity and innovation: A competence based model, *Leadership Quarterly*, 2003, 14, 433-454.

Socializing ethical behavior of foreign employees in multinational corporations, *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 2003, 12, 298-307.

Considering the labor contribution of students: An alternative to the student-as-customer metaphor, *Journal of Education for Business*, 2003, 78, 255-258

Implementing realistic job previews and expectation lowering procedures: A field experiment, *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 2002, 61, 263-278.

Self enhancing in perceptions of behaving unethically, *Journal of Education for Business*, 2001, 77, 21-28.

Developing a timescape-based framework for an online education strategy *International Journal of Educational Management*, 2002, 16, 18-39.

Assessing the "Conventional Wisdoms" of Management for the 21st Century, *Organizational Dynamics*, 2002, 30, 368-372.

Potential discrimination in the employment interview, *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, 2001, 13, 15-37

Examining the motivation of temporary employees: a holistic model and research framework, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 2001, 5, 339-354

The hypothesized relationship between accountability and ethical behavior, 2001, *Journal of Business Ethics*, 34, 57-73.

A historic perspective on organizational ignorance, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 2001, 6, 449-468.

Managing generation NeXt: Individual and organizational perspectives, 2001, *Review of Business*, 22, 81-85.

Cognitive ability and personality predictors of training program skill acquisition and job performance, 2001, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15, 523-548.

How to manage the emerging generational divide in the contemporary knowledge rich workplace, 2001, *Performance Improvement Quarterly*, 14, 125-144.

Ethical Issues in human resources systems, 2001, *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 11-29.

Human resources management: Some new directions. *Journal of Management*, 1999, 25, 385-415. (With G. R. Ferris, W. A. Hochwarter, and D. D. Frink)

Mentoring dual-career expatriates: A sensemaking and sensegiving social support process. *International Journal of Human Resources Management*, 1999, 10, 808-827. (with M. G. Harvey, M. S. Novicevich, and D. S. Wiese).

Practical, ethical, and scientific issues in organizational research: The disconnect between the science and practice of management. *Business Horizons*, 1998, 41, 31-38. (with G.R. Ferris, H. J. Bernardin, and M. G. Harvey).

Three factors influencing unethical behavior. *Teaching Business Ethics*, 1998, 2, 71-84. (with D.S. Wiese and M. Harvey)

Investigating newcomer expectations and job-related outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1998, 83, 452-461 (with D. B. Fedor, J. G. Veres, S. M. Carraher & D. S. Wiese).

Validation of an instrument to measure service orientation. *Journal of Quality Management*, 1998, 3, 211-224 (with S. M. Carraher, J. L. Mendoza, L. F. Schoenfeldt, C. E. Carraher).

An investigation into the dimensions of unethical behavior. *Journal of Education For Business*, 1998, 73, 284-290 (with D. S. Wiese and M. Harvey).

The process of developing an international program for dual-career couples. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1998, 8, 99-123 (with M. Harvey).

The evolution of the performance appraisal process. *Journal of Management History*, 1998, 4, 223-249 (with D. Wiese).

PAGE 6

A brief history of the selection interview: May the next 100 years be more fruitful
Journal of Management History, in press (with A. Norris & D. Wiese)

From the Internet to the Intranet: Suggestions for Oklahoma businesses.
Oklahoma Business Bulletin, in press (with D. S. Wiese, C. J. Evans, K. C. Brown, and T. Kissinger).

Oklahoma implication of the Family and Medical Leave Act. *Oklahoma Business Bulletin*, 1997, 65, 6-11.

The ethical imperative to provide recruits realistic job previews. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 1997, 9, 75-94 (With D. Fedor, S. Carraher, D. Frink, & D. Marvin).

Ethical issues for Oklahoma businesses. *Oklahoma Business Bulletin*, 1996, 64, 6-14 (with D. Wiese & T. Johnston).

Shifting organizational paradigms: Transitional management. *European Journal of Management*, 1997, 15, 45-57 (with R. Tersine and M. Harvey).

Inpatriation of foreign managers...building a global core competency. *Journal of World Business*, 1997, 33, 34-57 (With M. Harvey).

A historical perspective of the impact of feedback on behavior. *Journal of Management History*, 1996, 2, 21-33 (With D. Baker).

Pedagogical concerns in business education: The case of management science.
Advanced Management Journal, 1997, 52, 28-34 (with S. Barman & W. DeVaughn).

Reconsidering realistic job previews: A preliminary model. *International Journal of Management*, 1997, 14, 211-221 (With D. Fedor).

Cognitive complexity and the perceived dimensionality of pay satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1996, 81, 102-109 (with S. Carraher).

Should we write off graphology? *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 1996, 4, 78-86 (with R. Driver & D. Frink).

The interactive effects of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Worker's Compensation Laws in Oklahoma. *Oklahoma Business Bulletin*, 1995, 6, 31-39 (with N. Miceli & J. Lauber).

Ethical considerations in the recruiting process: A preliminary investigation and identification of research opportunities. *Human Resource Management Review*, 1994, 4, 35-50 (with D. Fedor & D. Marvin).

Benson.

The interview: Expecting a quick decision? *Personnel Administrator*, June, 1988, 59-62 (with R. Eder).

The impact of rating scale format on rater accuracy: An evaluation of the mixed standard scale. *Journal of Management*, 1988, 14, 67-75 (with P. Benson & S. Hall).

B.M. Springbett and the notion of the "snap decision" in the interview. *Journal of Management*, 1988, 14, 59-67 (with R. Eder).

On the need for more frequent monitoring of human resources in organizations. *Public Personnel Management*, 1988, 17(4), 435-442 (with D. Fedor).

Measurement error and theory testing in consumer research: An illustration of the importance of construct validation. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 1988, 24, 579-82 (with J. Cote).

Work patterns altered by new lifestyles. *Personnel Administrator*, 1988, 33, 40-43 (with D. Fedor & D. Kicza).

Tools and techniques for strategy implementation. *Long Range Planning*, 1988, 11, 67-74 (with R. Reed).

Employment at will: What every manager should know. *Personnel Administrator* August, 1988, 78-82 (with W. Weitzel).

Course grades and practical skills of personnel/industrial relations students: Reappraising management training. *Journal of Education for Business*, 1987, 62(4), 153-157 (with P. Benson).

Detecting scale recalibration in survey research: A laboratory investigation. *Group and Organization Studies*, 1987, 12, 464-481 (with A. Armenakis).

A note on the effectiveness of flextime as an organizational intervention. *Public Personnel Management*, 1987, 16(3), 259-267 (with D. Kicza & N. Crane).

Estimating trait, method, and error variance: Generalizing across seventy Construct validation studies. 1987, *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24, 315-318 (with J Cote).

Combining methodologies in the construct validation process: An empirical example. *Journal of Psychology*, 1987, 131, 301-309 (with J. Cote & R. Best).

Providing feedback to organization members: A reconsideration. *Journal of*

Business and Psychology, 1987, 2, 171-181 (with D. Fedor).

Reducing biases in performance evaluation through applications of decision theory. *International Journal of Management*, 1987, 4, 587-592 (with J. Veres).

Survey research measurement issues in evaluating change: A laboratory investigation. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1986, 10, 147-157 (with A. Armenakis & A. Bedeian).

The effect of locus of control on death anxiety. *Psychological Reports*, 1984, 44, 236-241 (with R. Gilligan).

Strategies in rater training. *Academy of Management Review*, 1981, 6, 205-212 (with H. J. Bernardin).

Proceedings, Contributed Papers, Book Chapters, and Books

An analysis of the meta-analyses of selection interview research. In R.W. Eder & M.M. Harris (Eds.), *The employment interviewer: Theory, research, and practice* (Second edition). Forthcoming, Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications (with C. Russell).

The effect of retention rule on the number of components retained: The case of cognitive complexity and the PSQ. *Proceedings of the Southern Management Association*, 1996, 145-145 (with S. Carraher).

The assessment of service orientation with biodata. *Proceedings of the Southern Management Association*, 1996, 264-267 (with S. Carraher).

Some unintended consequences associated with the implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act. In G.R. Ferris & M.R. Buckley (Eds.), *Human resources management: Perspectives, context, functions, and outcomes* (Third edition)(pp. 70-75). 1996, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall (with N. Miceli, E. Purvis & D. Gross).

Human resources management: Perspectives, context, functions, and outcomes (Third edition). 1996, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall (with G. Ferris).

The influence of cognitive complexity on the perceived dimensionality of the PSQ. *Proceedings of the Southwest Academy of Management*, 1995, 100-103.

The prediction of compensation with satisfaction. *Proceedings of the Southwest Academy of Management*, 1995, 96-99.

Confirmatory factor analysis and the assessment of method effects with MTMM Data *Proceeding of the Southern Management Association*, 1994, 399-401 (with S.

Carraher).

The legality of questions used in an interview. In H. J. Bernardin & J. E. Russell (Eds.), 1994, *Human resources management: An experiential approach* (pp.277-288) New York: Macmillan.

Edbuck Manufacturing, Inc. In H. J. Bernardin & J. E. Russell (Eds.), *Human resources management: An experiential approach* (pp.289-293) , 1994, New York: Macmillan.

Pay for performance. In H. J. Bernardin & J. E. Russell (Eds.), *Human resources management: An experiential approach* (pp.479-516) , 1994, New York: Macmillan.

The prediction of compensation satisfaction. *Proceedings of the Southwest Division Of the Academy of Management*, 1993, 105-109 (with S. Carraher).

An examination of the robustness of confirmatory factor analysis. *Proceedings of The Midwest Academy of Management*, 1993, 315-321 (with S. Carraher).

Reconsidering and extending the reduction of turnover using pa, job satisfaction, and labor market perceptions, *Proceedings of the Southwest Division of the Academy of Management*, 1992, 283-286 (with S. Carraher, D. Hart, & J. Sawyer).

The effect of retention rule on the number of factors retained: The case of the PSQ. *Proceedings of the Southern Management Association*, 1991, 493-495 (with S.Carraher).

Performance evaluation in high-technology firms: Process and politics. In L. Gomez-Mejia & M. Lawless (Eds.) *Organizational issues in high technology management* (pp. 243-263). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press (with G. Ferris).

Human resource management: Perspectives and Issues (Second edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon (with G. R. Ferris & K. Rowland).

Comment on the research methodologies used in interview research. In R. Eder And G. Ferris (Eds.) *The employment interview: Theory, research and practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage publications (with W. Weitzel).

The employment interview: An interactionist perspective. In G. Ferris and K.Rowland (Eds.) *Research in Personnel and human resources management*. (Vol. 6, pp 75-102). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press (with R. W. Eder).

A new perspective on the measurement of the change typology. *Proceedings of the Southern Management Association*, 1987, 157-159 (with J. Veres & L.

PAGE 111

The employment interview: An interactionist perspective. In G. Ferris and K. Rowland (Eds.) *Research in Personnel and human resources management*. (Vol. 6, pp 75-102). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press (with R. W. Eder).

A new perspective on the measurement of the change typology. *Proceedings of the Southern Management Association*, 1987, 157-159 (with J. Veres & L. Shake).

Implementing frequent organizational resource monitoring systems. *Proceedings of the Association of Human Resources Management and Organizational Behavior*. 1985, 353-358 (with D. Fedor).

Use of the retrospective design in evaluating organizational change. *Proceedings of the Southern Management Association*, 1983, 269-272.

Professional Presentations and Conference Activities

The effect of locus of control on death anxiety. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Eastern PSI CHI Honor Society, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1977 (with R.M. Gilligan).

Police performance assessment: Legal considerations. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1979 (with H.J. Bernardin).

An assessment of the components of an observer training program. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, Washington, D.C., 1980 (with H.J. Bernardin).

Frame of reference training with moderate and high performance feedback and diary-keeping. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, San Diego, California, 1981 (with H.J. Bernardin and J. Erickson).

Rater training in the 80's: The state of the future. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Personnel Management Assessment Council, Washington, D.C., 1981 (with H.J. Bernardin).

Future directions in rater training. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the IO/OB Graduate Student Conference, University of Maryland, 1982.

Legal aspects in the selection of public employees. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the IO/OB Graduate Student Conference, University of Maryland, 1982 (with W.J. Mea).

□PAGE □12□

A laboratory investigation of measurement interval as a cause of time-order error (TOE) Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Dallas, Texas, 1983 (with A.A. Armenakis and A.G. Bedeian).

On the use of the retrospective designs in the assessment of organizational change. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Management Association, Atlanta, Georgia, 1983 (with A.A. Armenakis and A.G. Bedeian).

A comparison of the scoring systems of the mixed standard scale. Paper presented At the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1984 (with P.G. Benson and T.G. Dickinson).

Conditions affecting time order error in survey research. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Boston, Massachusetts, 1984 (with A.A. Armenakis and A.G. Bedeian).

The use of ideal scales in detecting scale recalibration. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, San Diego, California, 1985 (with A.A. Armenakis).

Implementing frequent organizational resource monitoring systems (FORMS). Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Human Resources Management and Organizational Behavior, Boston, Massachusetts, 1985 (with D.B. Fedor).

Communicating strategic benefits through performance appraisal. Paper presented At the Annual Meeting of the Western Academy of Management, Reno, Nevada, 1986 (with R. Reed).

On the need for the reconceptualization of the selection interview. Paper presented At the Annual Meeting of the Association of Human Resources Management and Organizational Behavior, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1986 (with R.W. Eder).

B.M. Springbett and the notion of the "snap decision" in the selection interview. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1987.

Interview context. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1987 (with R.W. Eder).

Contrast effects: Another look across time. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1987 (with P. Villanova, A.A. Armenakis, and P.G. Benson).

Subordinate perceptions of supervisor feedback intentions. Paper presented at the

□PAGE □13□

Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1987 (with D.B. Fedor and R.W. Eder).

A new perspective on the measurement of the change typology. Paper presented at The Annual Meeting of the Southern Management Association, New Orleans, Louisiana, 1987 (with J.G. Veres and L. Shake).

Performance review systems in high technology firms. Paper presented at the "Managing the High Technology Firm Conference," Boulder, Colorado, 1988 (with G.R. Ferris, A.T. Yee and C.K. West).

The contributory effects of supervisor intentions on subordinate feedback responses. Paper presented at the Third Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Dallas, Texas, 1988 (with D.B. Fedor and R.W. Eder).

The role of supervisor intentions and power on subordinate reactions and responses to feedback. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Anaheim, California, 1988 (with R.W. Eder, D.B. Fedor, and C.O. Longenecker).

Research methodologies in the selection interview. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Anaheim, California, 1988.

Reconsidering the importance of method variance in research on self-reported Affect and perceptions at work. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Anaheim, California, 1988 (with L.J. Williams and J.A. Cote).

A survey of performance appraisal practices in high technology firms. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of TIMS/ORSA, Washington, D.C., 1988 (with G.R. Ferris).

How well are we measuring job satisfaction: The case of the JDI. Paper Presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Industrial/Organizational Psychology, Boston, May 1989.

Self-fulfilling first impression and the quick decision. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Society of Industrial/Organizational Psychology, Miami, Florida, April 1990.

The processing of job-related information: The case of realistic job previews. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, San Francisco, California, August 1990. (with D.B. Fedor)

□PAGE □14□

The managerial experience of management professors: A longitudinal study.
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, San Francisco, California, August 1990. (with D.A. Wren and L.K. Michaelsen)

Lowering expectations vs. providing realistic information in realistic job previews.
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Society of Industrial/Organizational Psychology, St. Louis, Missouri, 1991. (with D.B. Fedor and D.S. Marvin)

Assessing the factor structure of pay satisfaction instruments. Paper presented at The annual meeting of the Southern Management Association, Atlanta, Georgia, 1991 (with S. M. Carraher).

Reconsidering and extending the prediction of turnover using pay, job satisfaction, and labor market perceptions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Academy of Management, San Antonio, TX, 1992. (with S.M. Carraher)

Organizational implications of attitudes towards benefits. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Las Vegas, NV, 1992. (with S.M. Carraher)

The theory/applications balance in management pedagogy: Where do we stand?
Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Las Vegas, NV, 1992. (with D.A. Wren and L.K. Michaelsen)

A comparative study of POM related journals: A questionnaire survey. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Decision Sciences Institute, San Francisco, 1992. (with S. Barman and R.J. Tersine)

The prediction of compensation satisfaction. Paper presented at the annual Meeting of the SW Academy of Management, New Orleans, 1993. (with S.M. Carraher).

The prediction of compensation satisfaction with a teaching sample. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Dallas, 1994.

An examination of the robustness of confirmatory factor analysis. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Division of the Academy of Management, Lexington, 1994. (with S. M. Carraher).

Interview decisions and interview components: Contributions toward selection efficiency. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Management Association, New Orleans, 1994. (with R. W. Eder and N. S. Miceli).

PAGE 15

The prediction of compensation satisfaction. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwest Academy of Management, 1993, San Antonio, TX (with S. Carraher).

An examination of the robustness of confirmatory factor analysis. Paper presented At the Annual Meeting of the Midwest Academy of management, Milwaukee, WI, 1993 (with S. Carraher).

Confirmatory factor analysis and the assessment of method effects. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Southern Management Association, 1994, Atlanta, GA (with S. Carraher).

The influence of cognitive complexity on the perceived dimensionality of the PSQ. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southwest Academy of Management, San Antonio, TX, 1995 (with S. M. Carraher).

The effect of retention rule on the number of components retained: The case of cognitive complexity and the PSQ. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Southern Management Association, Orlando, FL, 1996 (with S. Carraher).

The Assessment of service orientation with biodata. Paper presented at the Annual meeting of the Southern Management Association, Orlando, FL, 1996 (with S. Carraher).

Research Under Review and Research in Progress

I have approximately 10 papers in various stages at a number of scholarly and practitioner outlets. A number of these have been conditionally accepted (e.g., *Academy of Management Executive*, *Academy of Management Learning and Education*)

Research Funding

Internal

Office of Graduate Research Award, Washington State University, 1985, 1986.

Noble Summer Research Grant, University of Oklahoma, 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1993.

Junior Faculty Research Fellowship, University of Oklahoma, 1988, 1989.

External

□PAGE □16□

City of Norman, Oklahoma, 1991, (\$35,000) to study their job classification system.

Human Resource Planning Society, 1991 (\$10,000) to study promotion system in organizations.

Society for Human Resource Management, 1992 (\$8,000) to study issues in satisfaction with compensation.

Federal Aviation Administration, 1994 (\$42,607) to study the use of the 16PF in the selection process.

Department of Corrections, State of Oklahoma, 1997 (\$75,000) to study the differences between public and private prisons in Oklahoma.

TEACHING AND GRADUATE STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

Courses taught (and institution where course was taught)

Undergraduate Courses

Organizational Behavior (Auburn University)
Human Resource Management (Washington State University)
Legal Issues in Selection (Washington State University)
Organizational Behavior (Washington State University)
Human Resource Management (University of Oklahoma)
Current Issues in HRM (University of Oklahoma)
Principles of Management (University of Oklahoma)
Labor Relations (University of Oklahoma)

Masters Courses

Organizational Behavior (Washington State University)
Organizational Behavior (University of Oklahoma)
Human Resources Management (University of Oklahoma)
Survey of HRM/OB (University of Oklahoma)

Doctoral Courses/Seminars

Industrial Relations (University of Oklahoma)
Planning, Staffing and
Development (University of Oklahoma)
Doctoral Seminar in
Organizational Behavior (University of Oklahoma)
Managerial Skills

□PAGE □17□

Assessment (University of Oklahoma)

Masters and Doctoral Committees

Washington State University

Masters Oral Committees

All students were required to pass an oral examination. I served on 36 of these committees.

□PAGE □18□

Doctoral Dissertation Committees

Nancy M. Crane--Ph. D. in Management--"Implementing Organizational Change on a Large Scale." (Member, 1986)

Mark Mone--Ph. D. in Management--"The Importance of Cognition in Managing Organizations." (Member, 1989)

University of Oklahoma

Masters Thesis Committees

We do not offer a Master's in the College of Business. I have served on 25 M. S. committees outside the College.

Doctoral Dissertation Committees

Mark Comstock--Ph. D. in Accounting--"Using Behavioral Measures to Assess Report Accuracy." (Member, 1989)

Robert DeMaris--Ph. D. in Marketing--"A Contingency Framework of Marketing Orientation." (Member, 1989)

Shawn Carraher--Ph. D. in Management--"The Effect of Individual Difference Variables on the perceived Dimensionality of Compensation Satisfaction." (Chair, 1991)

Elaine Sanders--Ph. D. in Accounting--"The Effects of information Cost an The Perceived Usefulness of Information." (Member, 1992)

Id Al-Shammari--Ph. D. in Management--"Best Member Performance versus Group Performance and the Influences of Maturity, Size, and Gender." (Member, 1993)

David Hubbard--Ph. D. in Sport Science and Recreation--"Analyzing the Jobs of Professional Sports General Managers." (Member, 1993)

Marilyn Korhonen--Ed. D. in Educational Leadership--"Program Planning Decisions in an External Degree Program: A Case Study." (Member, 1994)

JoAnne McMillan--Ed. D. in Educational Leadership--"Reducing Attrition in A Community College Sample with Non-Traditional Students." (Member, 1995)

N. S. Miceli--Ph. D. in Management--"Integrating the Disabled into the Workforce: The effects of Selection Interviews." (Co-Chair, 1996)

Tommie Mobbss--Ph. D. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology--An

□PAGE □19□

interactionist model on the influences of moral intensity, organizational environment and temperamental characteristics on ethical decision making in organizations." (Chair, 2001)

Danielle Beu--Ph. D. in Management--"Accountability as it influences ethical Behavior." (Chair, 2002)

Jonathon Halbesleben--Ph. D in Management--"Burnout and engagement: Correlates and measurement." (Chair, 2003)

Anthony Wheeler--Ph. D. in Industrial/Organizational Psychology--
"Multidimensional fit: A theory and a test of the influence of realistic job previews and pre-hire fit." (Chair, 2003)

Joseph Stauffer--Ph. D. in Management--"An investigation into the effects of birth order, sex, and personality on the likelihood of engaging in unethical behavior." (Chair, 2003)

SERVICE: PROFESSIONAL

Professional Affiliations

Academy of Management
American Psychological Association
Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology
Southern Management Association

Professional Activities

Research Reviewing and Professional Association Committees

Member of the Editorial Board for the following Journals:

Human Resource Management Review, 1992-present

Review of Business, 1990-1993

Journal of Management, 1997-present

Journal of Managerial Issues, 1997-present

Ad hoc reviewer for the following Journals:

□PAGE □20□

Academy of Management Journal

Administrative Science Quarterly

Journal of Management

Journal of Management Education

Journal of Applied Psychology

Journal of Business Ethics

Journal of Managerial Issues

Personnel Psychology

Academy of Management Review

SERVICE: UNIVERSITY

Washington State University

Faculty Advisor for the student Chapter of the American Society for Personnel Administration (ASPA), 1985-1987.

Department of Management student course Advisor, 1985-1987.

Coordinator of the Department of Management Doctoral Colloquium, 1985-1987.

University of Oklahoma

Faculty mentor of ASPA/Society of Human Resource Management Student Chapter, 1987-1994.

Ph.D. program coordinator for Management Division, 1987-1990, 1996 to Present.

Member of MBA program committee, 1988-1991.

Member of College of Business Promotion and Tenure Committee, 1989, 1993, 1996.

Member of School of Accounting Promotion and Tenure Committee, 1991, 1996.

□PAGE □21□

Member of Faculty Welfare Committee, 1989-1992.

Member of Speaker's Bureau, 1992-present.

Ad hoc Committee on Division Reorganization, 1991.

Member of College of Business Dean's Search Committee, 1992.

Member of Student Enhancement Program Committee. I taught an overload course on the enhancement of student skills without remuneration, 1989.

Coordinator of Management Division Doctoral Colloquium, 1988-present.

Chair, College Level Assessment Committee, 1993-present.

Member of the Faculty Compensation Committee

SERVICE: COMMUNITY AND PUBLIC

Invited Addresses

"Issues in the Performance Appraisal Process." Invited Address given to the Oklahoma City Human Resources Society, 1996.

"How to Conduct Performance Appraisals." Invited Address given annually to the Training and development Staff at the University of Oklahoma, 1995, 1996, 1997.

"Human Resource Issues for Librarians." Invited address given to the Pioneer County Multi-Library System, 1996.

"Legal Issues surrounding Performance Appraisal." Invited address given to the Employee Council at the University of Oklahoma, 1995.

"How to handle the Chronic whiner." Invited address given to the Oklahoma City Human Resource Society, 1994.

"Areas to avoid in a selection Interview." Invited address given to the Oklahoma City Human Resources Society, 1993.

"How to motivate employees." Invited address given to the Clinton, OK Chamber of Commerce, 1997

Volunteer Work

□PAGE □22□

Serve on the Finance Board for St. Mark the Evangelist Roman Catholic Church, Norman, Oklahoma.

Serve as a Lector for St. Mark the Evangelist Roman Catholic Church, Norman, Oklahoma.

Volunteer to develop selection programs for the City of Norman.

Chairman of the Parish Council, for St. Mark the Evangelist Roman Catholic Church, Norman, Oklahoma.

CONSULTING AND MANAGEMENT DEVELOPMENT

Expert witness in gender discrimination case (1986, 1988, 1991, 2000, 2001, 2005)

Expert witness in age discrimination case (1990, 1991, 1992, 1995, 2000, 2004)

Expert witness in racial discrimination case (1991, 1992, 1993, 1995, 1997, 1999, 2002, 2003, 2004)

Consultant to Fleming Companies, Inc., Oklahoma City (1992 to 1997). Advised on the reengineering of the human resources department.

Consultant to City of Norman (1987 to present). Advised on the selection of top level city managers.

Consultant to United States Geological Survey, Reston, VA (1989-1991, 2001). Advised on the development of a performance appraisal system and selection of top level managers.

A number of other Fortune 500 clients whom I am not at liberty to discuss due to confidentiality agreements. I have worked on projects ranging from refining performance appraisals to analyzing discrimination issues to human resources reorganization to assessment centers to CEO selection and development and management succession.